RR4

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/315,795	05/21/1999	AMIR WEINBERG	MERCURY.1CP1	6943

20995 7590 04/04/2003

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, THU HA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	20

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RR4

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 20

Application Number: 09/315,795
Filing Date: May 21, 1999
Appellant(s): WEINBERG ET AL.

Amir Weinberg, et al.
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed on December 19, 2002.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The amendment after final rejection filed on June 20, 2002 has not been entered.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 28-70 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

6,366,933	BALL et al.	10/27/1995

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 28-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ball et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,366,933.

As to claim 28, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer-implemented method for facilitating the management of a web site, comprising:

scanning the web site to generate a first data structure which represents the web site at a first point in time, wherein the web site comprises a collection of inter-linked hypertextual documents (abstract, col. 1 lines 51-57, col. 6 lines 45-54);

subsequently, after changes have been made to the web site, scanning the web site to generate a second data structure which represents the web site at a second point in time (abstract, col. 3 lines 23-35, col. 4 lines 4-67),

comparing the first data structure to the second data structure to identify modifications that were made to the web site between the first and the second points in time (abstract, col. 1 lines 51-57, col. 3 lines 29-35, col. 4 lines 30-40, col. 10 lines 38, col. 11 lines 15-27); and

generating a graphical map in which at least some of the modifications are represented (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38).

As to claim 29, **Ball** teaches the step of generating the graphical map comprises displaying at least one of the following types of objects in a distinct color: new nodes, new links, modified nodes, deleted nodes, and deleted links (figures 3-4, col. 5 lines 4-40). In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth

International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France with title WebGuide: querying and navigating changes in Web repositories (see http://www5conf.inria.fr/fich_html/papers/P38/Overview) to support HTMLDIFF of this invention as shown in section 4, figure 4, to provide users with the ability to see both insertion and deletion of web pages.

As to claim 30, **Ball** teaches the step of generating the graphical map comprises presenting a user an option to specify types of modifications to be displayed within the map (col. 9 lines 8-col. 10 lines 38).

As to claim 31, **Ball** teaches the graphical map includes icons that represent modified web pages, and the method further comprises responding to user selection of an icon that represents a modified web page by displaying the modified web page (figures 3, 11, col. 4 lines 40-67, col. 17 lines 14-65).

As to claim 32, **Ball** teaches the step of generating the graphical map comprises using a layout algorithm to position graphical representations of nodes and links of the web site on a display screen (figures 3-4, col. 5 lines 4-40. In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France to support HTMLDIFF of this invention as shown in section 4, figure 4).

As to claim 33, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, further comprising automatically sending to a user an email message which lists at least some of the modifications (figure 6, col. 7 lines 4-15, col. 11 line s50-col. 12 lines 9).

As to claim 34, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the web site is scanned and the first and second data structures compared automatically according to a pre-specified schedule (col. 12 lines 10-55).

As to claim 35, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein scanning the web site comprises storing attributes which indicate dates and times of last modification of content objects of the web site, and comparing the first and second data structures comprises comparing the attributes of like content objects to identify content objects that have been modified (figures, 3, 5, 7).

As to claim 36, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer-implemented method for facilitating the analysis of a web comprising:

comparing the web site at a first point in time to the web site at a second point in time to identify modifications made to the web site between the first and second points in time, wherein the web site comprises a collection of hypertextual documents interconnected by one or more links (abstract, col. 1 lines 51-57, col. 3 lines 23-35, col. 4 lines 4-67, col. 6 lines 45-54, col. 10 lines 38, col. 11 lines 15-27).

generating a graphical map in which at least some of the modifications to the web site are highlighted (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38).

As to claim 45, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a computer program, the computer program comprising:

a scanning module which scans a web site to generate a representation of the web site, the representation specifying at least an arrangement of nodes and links of the web site (abstract, col. 1 lines 51-57, col. 3 lines 23-35, col. 4 lines 4-67, col. 6 lines 45-54),

a comparison module which compares representations of the web site generated by the scanning module at different times to identify modifications made to the web site (abstract, col. 1 lines 51-57, col. 3 lines 29-35, col. 4 lines 30-40, col. 10 lines 38, col. 11 lines 15-27).

a mapping module which generates a graphical site map in which at least some of the modifications are highlighted (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38).

As to claim 53, **Ball** teaches wherein the graphical map comprises representations of a plurality of nodes of the web site (figures 3-4, col. 5 lines 4-40. In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France to support HTMLDIFF of this invention as shown in section 4, figure 4).

As to claim 54, **Ball** teaches wherein the graphical map further comprises representations of plurality of links of the web site (figures 3-4, col. 5 lines 4-40. In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France to support HTMLDIFF of this invention as shown in section 4, figure 4).

As to claim 55, **Ball** teaches the step of generating a graphical map (figures 3-4, col. 5 lines 4-40).

As to claim 56, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer program capable of performing the method of claim 28 (col. 4 lines 29-40, col. 5 lines 4-40).

As to claim 63, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer-implemented method for facilitating the management of the web site, comprising:

scanning the web site to generate a first data structure that includes representations of a plurality of nodes and links of the web site at a first point in time (abstract, col. 1 lines 51-57, col. 6 lines 45-54);

subsequently, after changes have been made to the web site, scanning the web site to generate a second data structure that includes representations of a plurality of nodes and links of the web site at a second point in time (abstract, col. 3 lines 23-35, col. 4 lines 4-67),

comparing the first data structure to the second data structure to identify changes made to the web site between the first and the second points in time (abstract, col. 1 lines 51-57, col. 3 lines 29-35, col. 4 lines 30-40, col. 10 lines 38, col. 11 lines 15-27).

generating a graphical map that depicts at least some of the changes, the graphical map including graphical representations of at least one of the following: (a) nodes that were added to the web site between first and second points in time; (b) links that were added to the web site between first and second points in time; (c) nodes that

were deleted from the web site between the first and second points in time; (d) links that were deleted from the web site between the first and second points in time; and (e) nodes of the web site that were modified between the first and second points in time (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38). In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France to support HTMLDIFF of this invention as shown in section 4, figure 4, to provide users with the ability to see the graph of insertion and deletion of web pages.

As to claim 64, **Ball** teaches wherein the graphical map includes representations of at least two of (a)-(e) (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38 In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France).

As to claim 65, **Ball** teaches wherein the graphical map includes representations of at least three of (a)-(e) (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38. In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France).

As to claim 66, **Ball** teaches wherein the graphical map includes representations of at least four of (a)-(e) (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38. In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of

HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France).

As to claim 67, **Ball** teaches wherein the graphical map includes representations of all of (a)-(e) (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38 In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France).

Claims 37-44 have similar limitations as claims 29-35, claim 46 has similar limitations as claim 29, claim 47 has similar limitations as claim 35, claim 48 has similar limitations as claim 34, claim 49 has similar limitation as claim 33, claim 50 has similar limitations as claim 30, claim 51 has similar limitations as claim 31, claim 52 has similar limitations as claim 32, claims 57-62 have similar limitations as claims 53-56, claim 68 has similar limitation as claim 29, claim 69 has similar limitations as claim 31, and claim 70 has similar limitations as claim 55; therefore, claims 37-44, 46-52, 57-62, and 68-70 are rejected under the same rationale.

(11) Response to Argument

Appellants argue that the reference does not teach or disclose scanning a web site in order to generate a representation of the web site, the first and second data structures compared automatically according to a pre-specified schedule, comparing the first data structure to the second data structure to identify modifications that were made to a web site between the first and second points in time, generating the map displaying at least one of the following types of objects: new nodes, new links, modified nodes, deleted nodes, and deleted links.

As per the 102 rejection, the arguments are not persuasive because the Ball et al.'s reference is a method and apparatus for tracking and viewing changes on the web. The Ball et al. reference discloses, as shown in figure 3, col. 6 lines 45-54, the user accesses the web page at different points in time with different versions and the HTMLDIFF software is scanning the web page automatically compare according the pre-specified schedule to show the differences as shown more in col. 11 lines 15-27, col. 12 lines 10-55. Moreover, Ball et al, discloses HTMLDIIFF which marks up HTML to indicate how web page has changed from pervious version and generating the map displaying at least one of the following types of objects: new nodes, new links, modified nodes, deleted nodes, and deleted links as shown in figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 10 lines 25-38. (Examiner cites an article title: "WebGuide: querying and navigating changes in Web repositories" (see http://www5conf.inria.fr/fich_html/papers/P38/Overview) to support the definition, function and component of HTMLDIFF of the claimed invention (see section 4, figure 4 in an article) to provide users with the ability to see highlighting the insertion, deletion and changes of nodes, links of web pages. As evidenced by the article of Webguide the reference to Ball et al. clearly has adequate teaching for scanning a web site in order to generate a representation of the web site, the first and second data structures compared automatically according to a pre-specified schedule, comparing the first data structure to the second data structure to identify modifications that were made to a web site between the first and second points in time, generating the map displaying at least

one of the following types of objects: new nodes, new links, modified nodes, deleted nodes, and deleted links.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Thu Ha Nguyen

April 1, 2003